



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 4, 2019

Ms. Barbara L. Quirk
Counsel for the City of Burkburnett
Shahan, Guevara, Decker & Arrott
201 South Lakeline Boulevard, Suite 202
Cedar Park, Texas 78613

OR2019-14646

Dear Ms. Quirk:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 768701.

The City of Burkburnett (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified document, including invoices for legal fees. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city only submitted attorney fee bills. We assume, to the extent any additional responsive information existed when the city received the request for information, the city has released it. If not, then the city must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides the following:

¹We note the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because the attorney client privilege is a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the applicability of section 552.107 and rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence to the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.302.

Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Section 552.107 of the Government Code section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6 (2002) (section 552.107 is not other law for purposes of section 552.022); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider the assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 for this information.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).


The city asserts the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the city has established some of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney client communications. We note an entry stating a memorandum or an email was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue was communicated and it does not reveal a client confidence. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under rule 503. Consequently, the city must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James E. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 768701

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)